DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 301 893 CS 506 478

AUTHOR Bissland, James H.; Rentner, Terry Lynn
TITLE Goal Conflict and Its Implications for Public Relations Practitioners: A National Survey.
PUB DATE Nov 88
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Public Relations Society of America (Cincinnati, OH, November 11-13, 1988).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Attitude Measures; Communication Research; *Conflict; Employee Attitudes; *Employer Employee Relationship; Higher Education; National Surveys; Occupational Surveys; *Organizational Objectives; *Public Relations; Questionnaires
IDENTIFIERS *Goal Incompatibility

ABSTRACT

A nationwide survey examined (1) differences between management's goals for public relations and the goals of public relations practitioners, and (2) the morale of public relations practitioners as related to this goal conflict. A 47-item questionnaire about various aspects of public relations work was completed by 557 fulltime public relations practitioners employed in internal departments. Results showed that a significant number (nearly 56%) of public relations practitioners perceived a conflict between management's goal for public relations and their own. Practitioners tended to favor a "mutual understanding" definition of public relations' goals; they believed their managements tended to prefer publicity, public information, or persuasion goals. Finally, public relations practitioners who perceived a dissimilarity between management's goals for public relations and their own, demonstrated significantly lower morale than practitioners who perceived comparability between management's goals and their own, as demonstrated by job satisfaction; similar differences were found with regard to predictions of likelihood of remaining with the same employer, and in the same career; and whether they would take the same job or enter the same career all over again, knowing what they know now. (Eight tables of survey data and questionnaire items are included.) (SR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED301893

GOAL CONFLICT AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR PUBLIC RELATIONS PRACTITIONERS: A NATIONAL SURVEY

James H. Bissland and Terry Lynn Rentner
School of Mass Communication
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
James B. Bissland
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Abstract

An organization's management and its staff must share certain goals in order to succeed. However, a nationwide survey of 557 in-house public relations practitioners shows that nearly 56% believe that the goal they set for public relations differs from the one management prefers. Practitioners tend to favor a "mutual understanding" definition of public relations' goal; they believe their managements tend to prefer publicity, public information, or persuasion goals. That this conflict has more than semantic significance is suggested by the lower morale associated with practitioners who perceive a dissimilarity between the public relations goal of management and themselves. The research raises a number of questions, but also indicates public relations' need for public relations begins in the workplace, where there appears to be a shortage of "mutual understanding."

A paper presented to the Educators Section
Public Relations Society of America
November 13, 1988

CS506478

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

One of social science's classic topics is the relationship between workers and the organizations which employ them. From Weber to Goffman, sociologists have probed the ways employees and their managements divide power and influence each other.

For those who study or practice public relations, an enduring topic is how public relations should be defined. The quest is more than the occupation's attempt to tidy up its identity and self-image, of course: it is part of public relations' effort to professionalize itself by specifying its "range, authority, and boundaries" (Eisikovits, p. 128).

That there may be a relationship between these two seemingly unrelated issues--social influence in task organizations, on the one hand, and the definition of public relations on the other--is suggested now by a national survey of public relations practitioners.

Raising more questions than it answers, the survey nonetheless draws new attention to a problem area for public relations people and the systems which employ them. Specifically, it is suggested here that a conflict over public relations' goals may exist in American task organizations, with serious implications for the careers of public relations practitioners.

THE FOUR MODELS

In 1984 Grunig and Hunt outlined four models of public relations practice, each representing not only a stage in the historical development of public relations, but also a body of currently preferred practices. The models "have different objectives, generally are found in different organizational settings, and generally require different means of evaluating their success," they explained (Managing Public Relations, p. 13).

The four models can be summarized as follows. (Grunig and Hunt's "rough estimates" of the percentages of all organizations practicing each model follow in parentheses.)

* The Press Agentry/Publicity Model, which evolved first and dominated the period 1850 to 1900. Its purpose is propaganda; its communication is one-way, and "complete

truth is not essential" (15%).

* The Public Information Model, said to appear about 1900 and dominating until the 1920s. Its purpose is the dissemination of information, its communication flows one way, but truth is important (50%).

* The Two-Way Asymmetric Model, which Grunig and Hunt see as developing in the 1920s. Scientific persuasion is said to be its purpose. Because information-gathering, as well as information dissemination, is deemed essential to the process, the communication in this model flows both ways, but the effects are still "imbalanced," because only the audiences of the organization are supposed to feel the effects of the communication, not the organization itself (20%).

* The Two-Way Symmetric Model, said to arise in the 1960s and 1970s, has "mutual understanding" as its purpose. The communication is two-way, and the organization as well as its publics expects to be affected by it, responding to perceived needs to act in the public interest (15%).

Grunig and Hunt argue each model is appropriate in certain situations, but acknowledge their own preference for the two-way symmetric model. Indeed, they quote other textbook authors and "top professionals" as favoring it. The Two-Way Symmetric Model appears to be the new ideal.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

A formal organization (such as a corporation or other employer) is, by definition, a social system "that has been established for the explicit purpose of achieving certain goals" (Blau and Scott, p. 1). It is also common in behavioral science to view individuals as goal-seeking creatures. The dysfunctions that can occur when there is conflict between the goals of individuals and the organizations employing them form an important theme in the literature (see, for example, Luthans).

Steinfatt and Miller (1974) have noted that there are "many conflict types;" for example, there may be conflict over ends or means. They see conflicts over ends as the more serious. Furthermore, conflicts about ends may be either conflicts of value or conflicts of interest (Aubert, 1963). At least some minimum consensus is implied by conflicts of interest, because shared values are assumed, but conflicts of value connote dissension over what is to be valued. As Rokeach (1967) has observed, parties conflicting over values tend to move away from each other as they seek others with more compatible values.

Historically, public relations practitioners have expressed a wide variety of definitions of public relations, and disagreed on the goals, or ends, appropriate for it. Scholars, critics and managers also have offered their views on public relations, how it operates and what it should seek to do. Because no consensus on these matters has yet emerged, it would seem reasonable to assume that different views about the ends or goals of public relations could be found within the same organization. Therefore, we hypothesize as follows:

> **H1:** A significant number of public relations practitioners perceive a difference, or "conflict," between management's goal for public relations and their own.

We suggest that to the extent public relations practitioners have developed professional consciousness (as opposed to organizational or "careerist" orientations), the more likely it is that public relations goal conflict will be conflict of value for them--while management may see any difference only as a relatively less serious conflict over means. Because of the discomfort a dissonance in goals can create in individuals (particularly those with high professional self-consciousness) we also hypothesize:

> **H2:** Public relations practitioners who believe management's goals for public relations are different from their own will demonstrate significantly lower morale than practitioners who perceive comparability between management's goals for public relations and their own.

METHODOLOGY

Instrument: To collect data, a four-page questionnaire containing 47 items about various aspects of public relations practitioners' work was employed. Key to the instrument were two items employing skeletal descriptions--based on Grunig's 1984 Public Relations Research & Education article--of the purpose (i.e., goal) of each of the four models. Our questionnaire items were written as follows (without, however, the models' names, which are included here for the convenience of the reader):

> Whether you consider yourself to be working in public relations or not, which ONE of the following--more than any other--is your PERSONAL definition of public relations?
>
> __ To publicize the organization, its products and services in any way possible [Press Agentry/Publicity].

__ To disseminate information to the public as truthfully and accurately as possible [Public Information].

__ To persuade the public to agree with the organization's point of view [Two-Way Asymmetric].

__ To develop mutual understanding between the management of the organization and the publics the organization affects [Two-Way Symmetric].

Which ONE of the following, more than any other, describes the real goal of your management's public relations practices?

__ To publicize the organization, its products and services in any way possible [Press Agentry/Publicity].

__ To disseminate information to the public as truthfully and accurately as possible [Public Information].

__ To persuade the public to agree with the organization's point of view [Two-Way Asymmetric].

__ To develop mutual understanding between the management of the organization and the publics the organization affects [Two-Way Symmetric].

(These summary statements of the ostensible purposes of each of the Grunig-Hunt models are not, of course, complete definitions in themselves, but, rather, "defining statements" which contribute some of the specificity required for a definition.)

Questions about demographics and job satisfaction were also asked on the survey instrument.

Sampling: The lack of a widely accepted definition of public relations, the variety of titles under which practitioners work, and other problems make it difficult to conduct probability samples of the occupation. For this study, it was decided to conduct a national survey two relatively accessible populations: the memberships of the Public Relations Society of America and the International Association of Business Communicators, the two largest associations in the field. Both organizations were included because it was believed doing so would broaden the representativeness of the sample. Nonetheless, it is also recognized that the two associations enroll a small fraction, at best, of the universe of practitioners, and that members of the

two groups may also be more highly professionalized than nonmembers. Results should be viewed in this light.

Questionnaires were mailed early in November, 1987, to 2,Ø31 members selected from the PRSA and the IABC. Members were selected by interval sampling: after a random start, every 12th name was drawn from the 1987-88 Register of PRSA and the 1987 WorldBook of IABC.

A total of 746 timely replies, or 36.8%, was received in response to one mailing; for budgetary reasons, no followup was conducted. For this paper, the original pool of 746 was reduced to 557 by culling out the following:

--All part-timers;

--All retirees;

--All professors;

--All incomplete questionnaires;

--All self-employed practitioners;

--All employees of public relations or communications agencies.

--All persons who omitted or replied negatively to this screening question: "Do you consider yourself to be employed in some aspect of public relations?"

As a result, this report is based on replies only from fulltime public relations practitioners employed in internal departments. This final, qualified sample of 557 includes representatives from 45 states plus the District of Columbia, and is almost equally balanced between the two associations: 276 respondents are PRSA members and 274 are members of IABC (affiliation could not be ascertained for 7 of the 557.)

Of the qualified sample, the majority of members--58.8%--are female. Median age for all sample members is 37 years; the mean, 38.5. Using Judd's version of Broom et al's measures of occupational role in public relations, the survey found that 54.2% saw themselves as "someone who facilitates communication and is involved in planning, policy and problem solving;" hereafter, these respondents are deemed to be "managers." Designated hereafter as "technicians" are those who described themselves on the questionnaire as "someone who mainly handles the production (i.e., writing, creating, processing, etc.) of messages and communication activities.

As expected, IABC members are more likely to be female, employed as technicians, and younger than the PRSA respondents: 62.9% of PRSA respondents are male, only 29.9% of the IABC respondents are. Managerial status is claimed by 54.9% of PRSA respondents; by 44.1% of IABC respondents. The mean age of PRSA respondents is 40.8 years; of IABC respondents, 36.2 years. In all cases, the differences between PRSA and IABC members are statistically significant.

RESULTS

Asked to express "your PERSONAL definition of public relations" by choosing one of four short statements of purpose reflecting the Grunig-Hunt models, practitioners strongly preferred the Two-Way Symmetrical statement. Two-thirds opted for it, with only 17% selecting to the second-most popular choice, the Public Information model.

****

Table 1 about here

****

Statistical tests reveal no significant differences between men and women, or between PRSA and IABC members, in the statements preferred. However, public relations managers are slightly more likely than technicians to prefer the Two-Way Symmetrical Model (chi square = 9.324, $p < .05$). In addition, those practitioners preferring the Two-Way Symmetrical Model had a mean age of 39.3, which is significantly older than their colleagues who, taken as a group, preferred the other three models. Their mean age was 36.6 years ($t = 2.973$, $p < .001$). Finally, respondents who report having had a major, a minor or graduate study in public relations do not differ significantly in their preferred models from respondents who have had no public relations or other communication education.

Conflict begins to appear, however, when respondents were asked which one of the four Grunig-Hunt statements "describes the real goal of your <u>management's</u> public relations practices?" While the Two-Way Symmetrical model is still the leading choice, it is imputed to management by only 31.1% of the respondents. The remaining three choices garner from 15.1% to 29.3% each.

****

Table 2 about here

****

As with personal preferences, the PRSA or IABC affiliation of respondents make no difference in the way management's public relations goals were perceived by practitioners. Gender does, however: compared to males, women were more likely to impute to management the Press Agentry/Publicity model and less likely to impute Two-Way Asymmetrical model (chi square = 17.17, $p < .001$). On the other hand, the models imputed to management do not differ according to the public relations manager/technician role of the respondent. However, those imputing the two-way asymmetrical model to management tend to be significantly older (mean = 39.8 years) than those imputing all other models (mean = 37.9 years; $t = 2.037$, $p < .05$). Finally, respondents who have a major, minor, or graduate study in public relations do not differ significantly in the models they impute, from respondents who had no public relations or other communication education.

Thus, about two-thirds of practitioners in our sample prefer the Two-Way Symmetrical definition of public relations' goal, but about two thirds impute some other goal to their managements. In how many cases, however, do practitioners believe their preferred model--whatever one of the four it is--is the same one they believe their management prefers? The two items concerning models were crosstabulated to find out.

****

Table 3 about here

****

By tracing the diagonal in Table 3, from upper left to lower right, one finds that a cumulative total of only 44.3% of the respondents prefer the same public relations goal they impute to management. Model by model, 8.7% of the respondents believe they share the Press Agentry/Publicity goal with management; 6.1% believe they share the Public Information goal with management; 2.2% believe they share the Asymmetric goal with management, and 27.3% believe they share the Symmetric goal with management. Compared to these "Similars," the remainder--55.3% of all respondents who completed both questions--perceive management's preferred goal for public relations conflict with their own (and are referred to hereafter as "Dissimilars").

Whether an organization is for profit or not-for-profit appears not to be related to the similarity of model preferences, real and imputed: a chi-square test shows no statistically significant difference between the two kinds of organizations in models preferred or imputed.

However, there may well be a relationship between model

dissimilarity, or goal conflict, and morale. Several measures used in the survey produced statistically significant relationships between goal conflict, job satisfaction and stability.

Asked to indicate in a four-point scale "all-in-all, how satisfied...you are with your present job," those respondents whose public relations goals matched those imputed to management (the Similars) clearly were more satisfied (mean = 3.38) than those whose models were not (mean = 3.03, t = 5.543, p < .001).

****

Table 4 about here

****

Respondents were also asked, "Five years from now, how likely it is that you will be working for the same employer?" and given a four-point scale, ranging from "Very Likely" to "Very Unlikely," on which to answer. Again, Similars and Dissimilars differ significantly: the former are more likely to respond affirmatively (mean = 2.74) than the latter (mean = 2.3, t = 4.536, p < .001).

****

Table 5 about here

****

Interestingly, Dissimilars are also less likely than Similars to predict they will even be "working in some aspect of the same career field" five years from now, although the difference between them was less pronounced than for jobs. Responding on the same four-point scale, Similars have a mean score of 3.65, Similars, 3.5 (t = 2.426, p < .05).

****

Table 6 about here

****

The survey also asked, "Knowing what you know now, if you had to decide all over again whether to take the job you now have, what would you decide?" Respondents could choose from 3-point scale, ranging from "I'd decide without hesitation to take the same job" to "I'd decide definitely NOT to take the same job." Once again, Similars are say they would be more likely to take the same job, with a mean score of 2.75 compared to Dissimilars' 2.59 (t=

3.521, p < .001).

****

Table 7 about here

****

Asked finally, "Knowing what you know now, if you had to decide all over again whether to enter the same career you are in now, what would you decide," and given the same scale, Similars are more likely to agree: their mean is 2.63, while that of Dissimilars is 2.5 (t= 2.659, p < .001).

****

Table 8 about here

****

DISCUSSION

Asked to choose a model according to the statement of purpose they prefer, two-thirds of our nationwide sample prefer the Two-way Symmetric model as their "definition" of public relations--although, of course, this says nothing about how they actually practice their craft. Asked to pick the model they believe their managements prefer, two thirds specify one of the three other possibilities--although, of course, this is only their opinion. In short, practitioners prefer to describe themselves as seeking a mutual understanding goal, while believing managements are far more likely to be interested in persuasion, information dissemination, or propaganda.

Clearly, then, the stage is set in many task organizations for a conflict over the goal of public relations. As analysis shows, nearly 56% of our sample believe they and their own managements have conflicting goals for public relations. The first hypothesis appears to be supported: A significant number of public relations practitioners perceive a difference, or "conflict," between management's goal for public relations and their own.

Whether this is merely a semantic conflict or whether it has social-psychological or behavioral consequences is the question implied by our second hypothesis. While a cause-and-effect relationship is not proven per se, our data does show statistically significant associations, on a number of measures, between model similarity and key indicators of morale. Specifically, practitioners who believe their preferred goals of

public relations differ from their managements':

-- Have lower overall job satisfaction;

-- Are less likely to predict they will be working for the same employer five years hence;

-- Are less likely to predict they will be working in some aspect of the same career five years hence;

-- Are less likely to believe they would take the same job all over again, "knowing what you know now;"

-- Are less likely to believe they would enter the same career again, "knowing what you know now."

These findings appear to support the second hypothesis: Public relations practitioners who believe management's goals for public relations are different from their own will demonstrate significantly lower morale than practitioners who perceive comparability between management's goals for public relations and their own.

It has been said that the findings of research only help us ask better questions. The following are some of the questions arising from this study:

* To what extent are model preferences expressed by practitioners influenced by their seeming "social desirability" ?

* To what extent, therefore, do public relations practitioners actually practice those models of public relations which they preach and management supports? What accounts for any discrepancies?

* To what extent do practitioners correctly attribute to management its preferred models?

* Conversely, what models do management attribute to practitioners, and how correct are they?

* When goals conflict within an organization, to what extent do practitioners preach one model and, under pressure from management, practice others?

* What methods do managements use to exert social control over their public relations offices?

* To what extent, and in what ways, do public relations practitioners apply their preferred models <u>in spite of</u> management opposition?

What may be beyond question, however, is the need for more "mutual understanding" between public relations and the very organizations it serves. Public relations' need for better public relations starts in the workplace, where a conflict of value appears related to morale problems of practitioners. As public relations professionalizes itself and practitioners internalize goals that may be conflict with management's, this need will only become greater.

Table 1

Preferred Models of Public Relations' Purpose

Personal definition of public relations	Number	Percent
1 = Publicity	62	11.3 %
2 = PublicInfor	94	17.2 %
3 = 2-way Asym	20	3.7 %
4 = 2-way Sym	371	67.8 %
Total	547	100.0 %

Missing cases = 10
Response percent = 98.2 %

Original item:

29. Whether you consider yourself to be working in public relations or not, which ONE of the following--more than any other--is your PERSONAL definition of public relations?

☐ To publicize the organization, its products and services in any way possible.

☐ To disseminate information to the public as truthfully and accurately as possible.

☐ To persuade the public to agree with the organization's point of view.

☐ To develop mutual understanding between the management of the organization and the publics the organization affects.

(Scored 1, 2, 3, 4)

Table 2

Models of Public Relations' Purpose Imputed to Management

Management's goal for PR practice	Number	Percent
1 = Publicity	161	29.3 %
2 = PublicInfor	83	15.1 %
3 = 2-way Asym	135	24.5 %
4 = 2-way Sym	171	31.1 %
Total	550	100.0 %

Missing cases = 7
Response percent = 98.7 %

Original item:

30. Which ONE of the following, more than any other, describes the real goal of *your management's* public relations practices?

☐ To publicize the organization, its products and services in any way possible.

☐ To disseminate information to the public as truthfully and accurately as possible.

☐ To persuade the public to agree with the organization's point of view.

☐ To develop mutual understanding between the management of the organization and the publics the organization affects.

(Scored 1, 2, 3, 4)

Table 3

Crosstabulation:

Management's goal for PR practice - (Y Axis)

- - - - BY - - - -

Personal definition of public relations - (X Axis)

Number / Row % / Column % / Total %		Publicity 1	Public Infor 2	2-way Asym 3	2-way Sym 4	Row Totals
Publicity	1	47 29.2 77.0 8.7	28 17.4 29.8 5.2	3 1.9 15.0 0.6	83 51.6 22.6 15.3	161 29.7
PublicInfor	2	6 7.4 9.8 1.1	33 40.7 35.1 6.1	3 3.7 15.0 0.6	39 48.1 10.6 7.2	81 14.9
2-way Asym	3	4 3.0 6.6 0.7	19 14.3 20.2 3.5	12 9.0 60.0 2.2	98 73.7 26.6 18.0	133 24.5
2-way Sym	4	4 2.4 6.6 0.7	14 8.3 14.9 2.6	2 1.2 10.0 0.4	148 88.1 40.2 27.3	168 30.9
Column Totals		61 11.2	94 17.3	20 3.7	368 67.8	543 100.0

Chi square = 137.574 Valid cases = 543
Degrees of freedom = 9 Missing cases = 14
Probability of chance = 0.000 Response rate = 97.5 %

(See Tables 1 & 2 for original items)

Table 4

Means and T-tests

Variable under analysis - All in all, how satisfied are you?

Variable used to group cases - Practitioner/Management Models

Group 1 1/
1=Similar Models

Number of cases	= 237
Mean	= 3.38
Variance	= 0.42
Standard deviation	= 0.65
Standard error of the mean	= 0.04

Group 2 2/
2=Dissimilar Models

Number of cases	= 315
Mean	= 3.03
Variance	= 0.63
Standard deviation	= 0.79
Standard error of the mean	= 0.04

T-Test statistics

Difference (Mean X - Mean Y)	= 0.351
Standard error of the difference	= 0.063
t - statistic	= 5.543
Degrees of freedom	= 550
Probability of t (One tailed test)	= 0.000
Probability of t (Two tailed test)	= 0.000

Mann-Whitney U	= -7007.6
Two-tailed probability	= 0.000

Original item:

...and all-in-all:

23. How satisfied would you say you are with your present job? (Circle one only)

Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Not too satisfied	Not at all satisfied

(Scored 4, 3, 2, 1)

Table 5

T-test of Means

Variable under analysis - Working for same employer in 5 years?

Variable used to group cases - Practitioner/Management Models

Group 1 1/
1=Similar Models

Number of cases	= 239
Mean	= 2.74
Variance	= 1.22
Standard deviation	= 1.10
Standard error of the mean	= 0.07

Group 2 2/
2=Dissimilar Models

Number of cases	= 315
Mean	= 2.30
Variance	= 1.23
Standard deviation	= 1.11
Standard error of the mean	= 0.06

T-Test statistics

Difference (Mean X - Mean Y)	= 0.432
Standard error of the difference	= 0.095
t - statistic	= 4.536
Degrees of freedom	= 552
Probability of t (One tailed test)	= 0.000
Probability of t (Two tailed test)	= 0.000

Mann-Whitney U	= -1300.5
Two-tailed probability	= 0.000

Original item:

31. Five years from now, how likely is it that you will be working *for the same employer?*

Very likely	Somewhat likely	Somewhat unlikely	Very unlikely

(Scored 4, 3, 2, 1)

Table 6

T-test of Means

Variable under analysis - Work in same career in 5 years?

Variable used to group cases - Practitioner/Management Models

Group 1 1/
1=Similar Models

Number of cases	= 240
Mean	= 3.65
Variance	= 0.37
Standard deviation	= 0.61
Standard error of the mean	= 0.04

Group 2 2/
2=Dissimilar Models

Number of cases	= 317
Mean	= 3.50
Variance	= 0.57
Standard deviation	= 0.75
Standard error of the mean	= 0.04

T-Test statistics

Difference (Mean X - Mean Y)	= 0.144
Standard error of the difference	= 0.059
t - statistic	= 2.426
Degrees of freedom	= 555
Probability of t (One tailed test)	= 0.007
Probability of t (Two tailed test)	= 0.015

Mann-Whitney U	= -3483.0
Two-tailed probability	= 0.000

Original item:

33. Five years from now, how likely is it that you will be working *in some aspect of the same career field you are in now?*

Very likely	Somewhat likely	Somewhat unlikely	Very unlikely

(Scored 4, 3, 2, 1)

Table 7

T-test of Means

Variable under analysis - Would you take same job again?

Variable used to group cases - Practitioner/Management Models

Group 1 1/
1=Similar Models

Number of cases	= 240
Mean	= 2.75
Variance	= 0.26
Standard deviation	= 0.51
Standard error of the mean	= 0.03

Group 2 2/
2=Dissimilar Models

Number of cases	= 317
Mean	= 2.59
Variance	= 0.34
Standard deviation	= 0.59
Standard error of the mean	= 0.03

T-Test statistics

Difference (Mean X - Mean Y)	= 0.167
Standard error of the difference	= 0.048
t - statistic	= 3.521
Degrees of freedom	= 555
Probability of t (One tailed test)	= 0.000
Probability of t (Two tailed test)	= 0.001

Mann-Whitney U	= -2491.7
Two-tailed probability	= 0.000

Original item.

35. Knowing what you know now, if you had to decide all over again whether to take the JOB you now have, what would you decide?

☐ I'd decide without hesitation to take the same job.

☐ I'd have some second thoughts.

☐ I'd decide definitely NOT to take the same job.

(Scored 3, 2, 1)

Table 8

T-test of Means

Variable under analysis - Would you enter same career again?

Variable used to group cases - Practitioner/Management Models

Group 1 1/
1=Similar Models

Number of cases	= 239
Mean	= 2.63
Variance	= 0.28
Standard deviation	= 0.53
Standard error of the mean	= 0.03

Group 2 2/
2=Dissimilar Models

Number of cases	= 316
Mean	= 2.50
Variance	= 0.31
Standard deviation	= 0.55
Standard error of the mean	= 0.03

T-Test statistics

Difference (Mean X - Mean Y)	= 0.124
Standard error of the difference	= 0.047
t - statistic	= 2.659
Degrees of freedom	= 553
Probability of t (One tailed test)	= 0.004
Probability of t (Two tailed test)	= 0.008

Mann-Whitney U	= -1934.8
Two-tailed probability	= 0.000

Original item:

36. Knowing what you know now, if you had to decide all over again whether to enter the same CAREER you are in now, what would you decide?

☐ I'd decide without hesitation to enter the same career.

☐ I'd have some second thoughts.

☐ I'd decide definitely NOT to enter the same career.

(Scored 3, 2, 1)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aubert, Vilhelm. "Competition and Dissensus: Two Types of Conflict and of Conflict Resolution," Journal of Conflict Resolution, 7 (1963), 26-42.

Blau, Peter M., and W. Richard Scott. Formal Organizations: A Comparative Approach. San Francisco: Chandler, 1962.

Deutsch, Morton. "Socially Relevant Science: Reflections on Some Studies of Inter-personal Conflict," American Psychologist, 24 (1969), 1076-1092.

Eisikovits, Zvi, Adrienne Chambon, Jerome Beker, and Mario Schulman. "A Conceptual Schema to Assess the Professional Development of the Child and Youth Care Field." Child Care Quarterly, 15 (Summer 1986), pp. 124-137.

Grunig, James E., and Todd Hunt. Managing Public Relations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1984.

Grunig, James E., "Organizations, Environments, and Models of Public Relations," Public Relations Research and Education, Vol. 1, Winter, 1984, pp. 6-29.

Judd, Larry R. "Role Relations Using Research and Organization Types," Public Relations Review (Summer 1987) XIII, No. 2, pp. 52-9.

Rokeach, Milton. The Open and Closed Mind. New York: Basic Books, 1960.

Steinfatt, Thomas M., and Gerald R. Miller, "Communication in Game Theoretic Models of Conflict," in Gerald R. Miller and Herbert W. Simons, eds., Perspectives on Communication in Social Conflict. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1974.